

REMARKS

This is a response to the office action mailed April 27, 2005. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application; claims 1-24 were rejected.

The applicant thanks the examiner for establishing the proper claim numbering. The applicant has adhered to the examiner's numbering.

Claims 1-5, 7, 12-16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Larson et al. (`460). Claims 6, 8, 9, 17, 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson in view of Kaman. Claims 10, 11, 23 and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Larson in view of Smith (`871).

The applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 12 and 18. The examiner will find that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

Larson et al. do not describe a system that uses a decision tree, rule-based system or inference engine to decide how to repair a piece of maintenance equipment; therefore, Larson cannot anticipate any of the claims as now amended.

Kaman et al. teach a vehicle engine analyzer and tutorial unit for training using wireless transmitters and

receivers. Kaman simply provides a way to remotely control a piece of maintenance equipment. There is no suggestion to combine Kaman with Larson.

Smith et al teach a system for diagnosing and reporting failure of a vehicle emission test. The examiner cites Fig. 6 as an example of a decision tree. However, Fig. 6 of Smith is not a decision tree, it is a tree that reports the probability of air induction being the problem for a vehicle emission test failure based on model year, O2-Idle, HC_2500 RPM, HC_Idle, CO2_2500 RPM and CO2_Idle. Tracing Smith's tree from its root to a leaf does not result in a decision that either suggests a new diagnostic or suggests a fix for the problem. To traverse Smith's tree, one must have already run a particular set of diagnostics. The result is simply a probability of a single type of failure (namely Air Induction).

With regard to amended claim 18, none of the references cited, either alone or in combination, teach repeating a process iteratively until a fix is found.

With the above in mind, the examiner will find that the claims, as amended, are allowable. The examiner is respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at his earliest convenience.



Respectively Submitted

Clifford Kraft

Clifford H. Kraft
Reg. No. 35,229
Attorney of Record

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Clifford H. Kraft
320 Robin Hill Dr.
Naperville, IL. 60540

708 528-9092 tel.

This paper is being filed by United States First Class Mail
with sufficient postage address to Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA. 22313-1450 by:

Signature: *Clifford Kraft*

Name: Clifford H. Kraft

Date: *July 25, 2005*